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ABSTRACT This article is about the role of tourist moral agency in governing. The affiliation between vacationing and governing is illustrated through the examination of a case study: the village of Canhane in Mozambique. The main touristic attribute of the village lies in residents' performance of a society in need, seeking outside solutions and guidance. Virtuous tourism in Canhane is the effect of a capitalist expansion in which ethics, community development, and governance are conflated with tourists' consumption. Specifically, the commodifying logic that emerges from the presence of virtuous tourists in the village derives primarily from three subjects: tourists' self-aspirations, residents' ambition to integrate into the broader socioeconomic order, and the politicization of virtue stimulated by the development industry. Ultimately, this article shows how the cultivation of ethics through tourism consumption has become an ally for the exercise of nongovernmental governance over public spheres.

Almost two decades ago, Lester Salamon wrote, “We are in the midst of a global ‘associational revolution’ that may prove to be as significant to the latter twentieth century as the rise of the nation-state was to the latter nineteenth” (1994:109). Ten years later, shortly after the tsunami hit the coastlines of the Indian Ocean in December of 2004, the president of the not-for-profit association Pacific Asia Travel, Peter de Yong, made a global appeal: “Tourists, if you want to help us, book your trip now.” As he clarified later, “The money you spend and, importantly, the hearts you touch will make a difference.”

More recently, in January of 2011, Mohan Munasinghe, who shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with the former Vice President of the United States, Al Gore, introduced the Millennium Consumption Goals at the United Nations. The idea was simple: in the face of the perils that consumption presented to sustainable livelihoods, instead of viewing the consumers as a problem, they would be converted into the solution.

What sense can we make of this sequence?

Much has already been said about consumption and consumers. For over a century, “humans-turned-consumers” (Bauman 2007:101) have been variously described by academicians and in public discourse as passive dupes, dopes, or the heroes of everyday life. The influential late-19th-century economist J. A. Hobson, for example, argued that “consumption was an agent of ‘aesthetic and moral advance’” (Freeden 1988:100). In the same epoch, the French political economist Charles Gide referred to consumers as a “reign of truth and justice” (Hilton 2008:212). However, the perils of consumption were never as central as they are today. The global advent of the ideology of sustainability and the current globalized financial crises have animated politicians, activists, and professionals from a wide variety of backgrounds and generated a burgeoning field of criticism against consumer capitalism. Hence, it was no surprise that “consumerism,” as Richard Wilk (2001:249) observed, “became the major theme of a critique of modernism in general.”

Apart from the debate over the character of consumption and consumers, John Stuart Mill (2007) stated in the 19th century that the desire to consume is a “general principle,” meaning universal, irreversible, and intrinsic. This statement remains as true now as it was then. Inevitably, the same tactics that threaten the consumer system can be appropriated and, in turn, reformulated in a way that benefits or even reinforces the system. A clear example of this occurs when “buycotts” emerge to reverse movements, such as boycotts, designed to disrupt the consumer system. In contrast to a boycott, a buycott occurs when people explicitely consume products or services in moral support of certain corporations, countries, or politics. Despite counter-acting one another, buycotts and boycotts share a structural
basis: both use the market in an attempt to ethically regulate society. In doing so, the anonymous individual attempts to exercise social power, not through votes but, rather, through consumer behavior.

There may be an existential cost, however, for consumers collectively exercising social power. Consumption of commodities is becoming the purpose of human existence and thus a major determinant of both identities and self-cultivation, at least in most of the “North” (e.g., Barnett et al. 2005; Bauman 2007; Belk 1988:139; Campbell 2004:27; Miller 1995:15; Russ 2005:142). This line of thought leads to a reasonable and extensive area of inquiry. What creates meanings in consumption? Further, what does the consumption of these meanings induce the consumer to be(come)?

In this article, I explore answers to these questions by focusing on ethical consumption in tourism. More precisely, this work is an analysis of virtuous tourism in the village of Canhane in southern Mozambique. During anthropological fieldwork in this village, I encountered an unusual subject in tourism research—namely, ethical tourism consumption legitimizing new modes of governance by nongovernmental agents. Accordingly, virtuous tourism invests delocalized nongovernmental entities with the power to govern and, thus, may become a colonizing mechanism for conquering new territories and peoples, albeit masked by a veneer of ethics. Canhane attests to this new development. As a final clarification, I am not concerned here with what the virtuous tourists or the residents of Canhane make but, rather, what makes them.

Under the umbrella of globalizing ideas concerning climate change, a “common future,” and sustainability, the integration of ethics into consumption has become increasingly central to conceptions of lifestyle and society. Ethical consumption and the consumption of ethics are a matter of identity expression and self-cultivation but also a way for individuals to participate in new governing rationalities that consider the entire planet. In methodological terms, the analysis of the apparatus behind the constitution of ethical subjects and the forces dragging these subjects into the market provides us not just with answers about the identities of ethical consumers but also information about the mechanisms of governing the realities in which the ethical consumers participate. In other words, it elucidates the ways in which consumers exercise social virtue—such as spending holidays in community-based enterprises in Africa—and the realities they intend to fix through consumption, specifically the local societies they visit. These events are part of and lead to an emerging governing order. In this new order, governance is not gained and exercised through coercive power, military intervention, or democratic elections; rather, it is through the use of an ethics that sensitizes and therefore mobilizes consumers. As it will be shown, in this new governing order, the duties of funding, auditing, regulating, educating, monitoring, disciplining, conducting, and developing social subjects, particularly in the “South,” are self-assigned to nongovernmental agents. Mobilized virtuous tourists fill this role.

Through the use of the Mozambican example, my intention is not to present an archetypal case but, instead, to provide credible and reliable theoretical reflections drawn from one empirical case. For the sake of this journey, I explore a particular subject and one particular practice in the sphere of ethical consumption: local communities in the “South” as the subject of moral concern and virtuous tourism as the practice through which the consumer exercises ethical duty and, in turn, participates in nongovernmental governance. Ultimately, the virtuous tourists that emerge from this work are participative agents of nongovernmental governance and share its responsibilities. They participate in the worldwide expansion of such a governing order by consuming in distant localities under the aegis of particular ethics. Therefore, they are not passive: they do things with those ethics. As we will see, the virtuous tourists demonstrate how consumers can be more than just the subject of governance but simultaneously participate as governing agents in their own right.

**INTRODUCING TOURISM**

While lecturing for one semester at two universities in Angola, I made a visit to the Peace Parks Foundation in Stellenbosch, South Africa. I was considering possibilities for my Ph.D. proposal in social anthropology. At the South African foundation, I was introduced to “an interesting win-win case of community development and empowerment through tourism in Mozambique,” as I was told by the head of the department working with rural populations (August 2, 2006). At the end of our meeting, I was given a few essential contacts necessary to receive authorization to research such a win-win case. These contacts were all persons working for the delegation of the Swiss nongovernmental organization (NGO) Helvetas in Maputo, the capital of Mozambique.

One month later, I went to Mozambique to meet the NGO staff. In short, all the information and authorizations I needed for starting the research in the village were provided during the meetings with Helvetas. All except one: “You may also have to speak with the community leader, but that is just a mere matter of politeness, for them not to be offended.” I was even asked at the NGO’s office if I wanted to rent a hut. “Isn’t better to inquire the local authorities about that?” I suggested. “If you prefer,” the Mozambican head of the project replied before he clarified another issue, “but if you wish to stay also at the Covane Lodge, closer to the tourists, speak first with us or with the manager of the lodge, not with the community” (September 1, 2006).
indicated something that became conspicuous later in my research: the introduction of tourism activity that merges virtue with tourists’ consumption fostered a new way of governance over the local society.

To state it clearly from the beginning, virtuous tourism fomented outsiders’ nongovernmental governance over the village of Canhane.

The tourism project in Canhane carries other labels than “virtuous tourism.” Such a term, however, is adopted in this article to make clear the moral signature of the modality of tourism in the village. Officially, the residents are developing a community-based tourism, which has been widely described as “tourism ventures that local community groups manage and operate so that the income earned from tourism directly benefits community members, reinforces their cultural identity, and provides opportunities for sustainable development” (Gmelch 2010:13). Although the management and benefits are attributed to the “community members,” the tourism enterprise in Canhane was an initiative of international development professionals.

This all began in early 2001, when the Swiss director of Helvetas in Maputo consulted the periodic print-run publication of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Nelspruit, South Africa. The journal announced the awarding of grants for community development in the southeast region of Mozambique. “The content of USAID’s announcement was very generic and it only mentioned broadly the area of implementation,” one of the staff working for Helvetas confirmed for me (September 1, 2006). The NGO did not wait long after applying to receive an affirmative response and obtained an initial $50,000 in funding from USAID. The idea behind the successful proposal was simple: the NGO intended to establish a tourist lodge that would help a local community. However, the area in which the project would be implemented was not yet clear. The exact location and target population were chosen only after Helvetas’ consultations in 2002.

If the issue did not yet deserve particular consideration, when Helvetas publicly declared its interest in finding a space for the lodge, the location became the subject of dispute between two villages, Canhane and Cubo. This matter remains a source of conflict today, and I experienced it. “Where does Cubo begin?” an elder in the village of Canhane asked to reflect my question back at me. “Pay attention,” he continued in a serious tone, “in this direction there is a baobab which marks the limits of Canhane. If you proceed from there toward the river, after a while you’ll see a lot of hedges concentrated in one spot. That’s the other limit of Canhane” (February 27, 2008). However, according to the community leader of the neighborhood village of Cubo, the baobab tree he mentioned only started to be a border reference after Helvetas informed Canhane’s residents about the lodge. “Our lands go further than the baobab,” he said in an irritated mood, “Canhane only starts after the path that goes down to the river, which is far after the baobab that they indicate” (October 17, 2008). In his version, the lodge’s location is therefore on Cubo lands. More than disputing important spaces for collective identity, the desire to be included in the tourism project—to be “helped”—underlined the quarrel between the two historically subjugated populations. For the residents of both villages, a cartography of hope was being drawn.

However, in a world in which it profoundly matters who controls the terms of negotiations (Errington and Gewertz 2010:93), the inhabitants’ emerging campaigns for land recognition did not play a decisive role. The introduction of a novel form of moral tourism in the region brought legitimacy to the decisions of the new delocalized arbiters. Accordingly, in March of 2003, the area for the lodge’s implementation was formally recognized by Helvetas to be in the jurisdiction of Canhane (Helvetas 2002), home to around 650 residents. The regulatory character of the international NGO throughout this process represents a broader theme that is at the core of this article: nongovernmental agents play an increasing role in constituting subjects according to how people make their lives. But, above all, the escalation of nongovernmental authority over the local came from the introduction of a special typology of tourism into the region—a morally superior form of vacation travel that carried the missionary flag of ethics and sustainable development. Virtuous tourism expedited the nongovernmentalization of governance over Canhane.

In practice, by introducing new spatial limits and definitions (e.g., community borders, community-based tourism, development, empowerment), the nongovernmental institution is producing new spatial and sociological realities. That is to say, the NGO was effectively “structuring the possible fields of actions of others,” to use Michel Foucault’s (1982:21) definition of governing. Helvetas’ attribution of the area of the lodge to one village—Canhane—does, indeed, structure and enable new possibilities, actions, and, ultimately, realities. It enables the residents of Canhane, in the same way that it fails to enable the residents of Cubo, to derive income from tourism. It enables a new field of ethical agency for tourists. Moreover, it enables a field of nongovernmental regulation and opportunity, in particular for the consultations, courses, workshops, and expertise intervention that followed.

During 2008, for example, I experienced a series of nine externally driven courses for Canhane’s residents, designed to facilitate “community capacity building,” as their proponents called it. The funding for these courses went to the institution directing their implementation “on the ground,” which was the Mozambican NGO LUPA. At the beginning of 2008, this organization took charge of all monitoring of the tourism project because Helvetas decided to close its delegation in Maputo. The transition was an internal process, mainly because the founders of LUPA were part of the staff working for Helvetas-Maputo, who were then redeployed after its cessation. Consequently, at least up until the end of November of 2008, most of the residents in Canhane did not know about the passage of leadership between the NGOs. “Is
that so?” a man over his fortieth commented after I mentioned it. “Strange that I never heard about that: maybe it is because it is not important.” Another man who had remained quiet during the entire conversation raised his voice and said: “The community leader must know nothing as well, otherwise we all would know. Maybe his son knows. But they [the professionals from Helvetas or LUPA] should come here and tell us these things, for us not to be diminished” (November 22, 2008). Thus, ironically in the era of globalizing democracy, as conspicuously advocated in development discourses by NGOs, interventions such as those in Canhane represent the emergence of new modes of regulating societies through unelected agents rather than strengthening democratically elected institutions and officials that are at least in some form controlled by the people.

The lodge built on the contested land took the name of the first community leader of Canhane—Covane Community Lodge—and it finally opened to tourists in May of 2004. With the concretization of this project, the international NGO Helvetas, as the United Nations World Tourism Organization (WTO) made clear, “was a pioneer in the introduction of community-based tourism in Mozambique.” Since then, the lodge and Canhane have been extensively cited, particularly in development literature, as an “important new model for community development” (Norfolk and Tanner 2007:16).

However, these narratives about Canhane are informed by a broader context. The significance of the local tourism project lies in the fact that it was the result of a form of globalizing politics that allocates moral status to transnational consumers. Canhane attests to the expansion of such a form of politics from “the society of consumers”—a kind of society that interpolates its members primarily in their capacity as consumers (Bauman 2007:52)—onto rural societies in the “South.” The introduction of virtuous tourism in Canhane, where tourists’ consumption is celebrated for having a higher moral purpose, serves to facilitate this expansion of consumer politics. Although it is the ethical umbrella that shelters this activity, virtuous tourism is also an enabling tool of modern globalization. As a consumer intending to do good, the virtuous tourist is a vehicle for the international expansion and moralization of products as disparate as holidays, coffee, air flights, pharmaceuticals, handicrafts, or even soft drinks like, as we will see later, Coca-Cola. Through virtuous tourism, these products are ideologically transformed from destructive capitalist choices to benign moral choices.

CONSUMING FOR GOOD

Particularly since the 1960s, the impact of modern consumerism, globalization, and capitalism on local communities has captured public attention and generally been deemed destructive. As the materialization of such ideals, tourism became the embodiment of the defects of most of the deceptive industries (Crick 1989:309). These insights have led to contemporary calls for the incorporation of global principles of ethics into the tourism sector, which was formally expressed in Agenda 21 and adopted at the Earth Summit in 1992. As described in an article entitled “The Non-Governmental Order” in the news magazine The Economist (1999), the outcome of this conference represented “the beginning of a series of victories by NGOs.” Since this moment, a new domain of influence that ascribes moral value to consumption has been incorporated into tourism. This signaled the beginning of a new era where “tourism is no longer a dirty word” (Tourism Concern 2009:7), and virtuous tourism emerged.

The tourism project in the Mozambican village of Canhane is a product of these transnational events. Therefore, we should bear in mind that what makes tourism in Canhane, and all other ethical forms of tourism in the “South,” a field of moral agency is undoubtedly tourists’ consumption. In concrete terms, the revenues generated through consumption in the Covane Community Lodge are what make the tourists’ presence in Canhane intimately bonded to community development and, thus, morally worthy. In such a view, not only is tourism in the village said to help those most in need, but it also allows tourists to become better individuals. It gives them a role informed by virtue: that is, the responsibility of improving the lives of others while spending on holidays to redress economic inequalities.

I must clarify, though, that some tourists staying at Canhane do not fit this model. One explained, “We came by accident. It was late and the kids needed a bed to sleep in, so I turned when I saw the sign (pointing at the direction of the lodge) on the road” (February 13, 2008). This family, for instance, was from South Africa and had no interest in Canhane beyond “a bed to sleep in.” Nonetheless, they represent a minority. Most of the tourists I met at the village, particularly the North Americans and Europeans, had chosen to spend their holidays at the Covane Lodge as a way to engage in a conception of ethical duty leading toward idealized community development. They are the virtuous tourists. Take the following example.

It was one of the hottest days I experienced in Mozambique. “Today burns,” said an elder of Canhane. A Mozambican from the city of Maputo passed by the village that day. He worked for Limpopo National Park in the Conservation Department. He met me, together with two residents, in the shadow of the biggest tree in Canhane. At one point he said, “Today is impossible, and it is catastrophic not having anything cold to drink close by.” He had arrived by car, so I informed him of the Covane Lodge, which was seven kilometers from there. “I know about that,” he said, “but it’s immoral the prices they charge in the lodge. I can’t accept that they charge in a one-star place the same for a beer as in a chic restaurant in Maputo.” Despite his complaints, we ended up going to the lodge where we met a tourist who was in the restaurant drinking a Coca-Cola. The subject of drink prices came up, once again initiated by the Mozambican who returned to the expression “immoral” to classify them. However, this time he encountered a counterargument: “Immoral?” the tourist exclaimed, raising his
eyebrows at him, “To the contrary! I don’t mind paying more if that money is for community development. Immoral is to pay this price in a restaurant in Maputo, but here it is moral” (September 26, 2008). Just after he said this, he grabbed the Coca-Cola, put the bottle to his mouth, closed his eyes, and swallowed the rest of the liquid. He ingested more than just the liquid: he filled himself up with morality.

“Sign value” is an important component of commodities produced in the postmodern economy. It provides consumers with symbolic resources they can use to construct, change, and reinforce identitarian issues, as projects for their selves. In this view, “what is being sold [and consumed] is not just the direct use of a commodity, but its symbolic significance as a particular ingredient of a cohesive lifestyle” (Watson and Kopachevsky 1994:656). This is why, under the effects of the politics of benevolence that animates the constitution of knowledges in and about Africa (Ferguson 2006; Mbembe 2001), a globally ubiquitous product like Coca-Cola—often acknowledged for its imperialist attributes (e.g., see Cultural Anthropology 22[4])—is loaded with the character of a moral commodity at the lodge in Canhane: as the tourist said, here it “is for community development.”

The Coca-Cola episode informs the new face of tourism in the “South.” In particular, the idea of community-based tourism is accompanied by moralistic assertions that attest to the replacement of a language of fun, relaxation, and hedonism with a language of virtuosity and moral duty. This language transition in tourism informs the specificity of a market—a market in which the ethical prefix “community-based” allows the tourism industry to improve its own image; a market whose products are not just any kind but specifically moral ones; a market that integrates the “problems of the South” (Escobar 1984) as the attractive product that needs to be resolved through tourists’ consumption and aid; a market directed at the cultivation of consumer selves; a market that ultimately rests on a politics of righteousness based in consumption.

Fundamentally, the Coca-Cola example, along with many other consumption practices at the Covane Lodge, is an expression of care, guidance, and responsibility. The tourist used his purchasing power to manifest virtue within an idealized conception of how to act toward the good of the local society. Canhane is, indeed, a site stimulated by an ideal and by the reproduction of the ethics of that ideal: virtuous tourism is not just about purchasing during vacations but also about the consumption of the ideal that supports and animates these acts of consumption. Through this process, the tourist-purchaser not only acquires and fortifies his or her moral self but also engages in a developmental role in the society where she or he stays. For example, in addition to conscious spending at the Covane Lodge, tourists often make donations in a box at the reception. As I witnessed many times, just before or during the placement of money in the box, the tourist-donors (Baptista 2011) stated where that money should be applied: “this is for the wa-

ter supply” (September 9, 2006); “for the school” (October 15, 2008); “for you to buy T-shirts for the football team” (September 23, 2008), among many other examples. Similarly, in the guestbook, tourists recorded their opinions about the lodge, the village, the residents, and, most importantly, about what should be done for the betterment of the population.

In Canhane, the virtuous tourists are more than simply tourists. The air of virtue that floats over their bodies stimulates in them a governing role over the local and its people. “You must save money to buy solar panels because they allow you to have energy, and then you can fish more, have milk for the children and meat for the adults because you can have a fridge that conserve the aliments,” an Italian tourist who was working in Maputo told a group of women at Canhane. They were pilling corn when he arrived. The women smiled at him. At the end of the encounter, he said in a friendly but also didactic tone, “I hope you have taken me seriously and memorized what I said, because this is for your own good. I’ll come here next year to see you again,” and he blinked an eye at them (September 29, 2008).

What role does the village population play in empowering tourists?

“GO AND GAIN MORE FROM OUR VILLAGE”

When tourists arrive at the reception desk of the Covane Community Lodge, they inevitably encounter two phrases that are prominently posted on the wall closest to the balcony:

Your presence contributes to the improvement of the livelihoods of the population of the village of Canhane. Kanimambo a lot!

Kanimambo means thanks in Shangane, the language spoken in the region. The greeting is posted with thumbtacks over a mat of straw on the wall. Its modest outward aspect is coherent with its content. The asymmetries between “hosts and guests” (Smith 1989), Africa and the Rest are announced. Implicitly, the village is presented as the embodiment of necessitousness, while tourists are endorsed as agents of improvement. Who, it seems reasonable to inquire, are the authors of this welcome?

Answering this is not as easy as it might sound. I questioned the residents, the manager and submanager of the lodge, and the staff of the Helvetas and LUPA NGOs about the message’s authorship. There was no agreement. In the first place, the NGOs’ staff decentralized the authorship. The head of LUPA said, “We and the community have decided on that” (September 17, 2008). However, the Canhaners mentioned the community leader or the general population of the village as the authors of the text. After all, one of the virtues of the tourism enterprise is that, on paper, it is community based, which means it is managed, controlled, and produced by the members of “the community.” Despite the Canhaners’ assertion, evidence gathered during my fieldwork indicates that the residents’ answers were instead a rhetorical performance supporting and justifying the
community-based ideology and, thus, the virtuous aura of the tourism project.

Put simply, Canhaners did not write or idealize this or any other text in the lodge; instead, they authorized them. Just like the entire tourism project, they participated in the process by approving what they were told by Helvetas and LUIPA, not by creating what was to be shown or done. Yet when they claimed for themselves, or for the figure of the community leader, the authorship of the text, they were participating in the reproduction of a reality that verifies the tourists’ presence, spending, and moral agency. In other words, Canhaners authenticate the community-based character of the project by performing stakeholderness in the same way they embody simplicity, commitment, purity, and need. Subordination here works not through domination but by consent. Take the following text, also displayed at the reception and in the booklets placed in the chalets, as another example:

The woman wakes up at 5.00 am and goes to fetch water in a bore hole. After that she goes to the field. At 10.00 am she comes back home carrying firewood for cooking and to clean the house. In the afternoon, if it is rain season she goes back to the field to remove the grass. The husband and the children wake up at 6.00 am.

The man normally goes to the field to help the wife or he can go to carry firewood, fishing and house maintenance. In the afternoon the man can repair some small things in the house and visit friends. The children go to school from 7.30 – 12.00. In the afternoon they help the parents with domestic jobs.

The man takes the family decisions. But first, consulting the wife particularly related with the marriage of the kids, school education and allocation of land.

Go and gain more from our village. Stay well.

This text fosters the idea that the everyday life of the village is part of what is offered to tourists. It reproduces a harmonized image of the social structure of Canhane. The inhabitants are organized into a vision of homogeneity, self-contained in an expected unit for the tourists and, therefore, tractable. The stereotyping of the village and its members reinforces the visitors’ imagined sense of the economic asymmetry between them and the residents, which consequently validates the tourists’ aspirations in assisting the local population. However, perhaps more importantly, this text shows the central role of the interrelationship between the tourists and the residents in the tourism program: “Go and gain more from our village.” Among other things, the text indicates the importance the residents’ conduct has in the tourism experience. To that end, the actions of the residents of Canhane are essential in informing, if not confirming, the tourists’ role in community development. To demonstrate this better, let me go back to September of 2006 and relate the story of the water-supply endeavor in Canhane.

About two years after Covane Lodge opened to tourists, Canhaners started digging a long ditch and burying flexible plastic pipes to be used to provide water for the village. The construction materials were manifestly exposed throughout what might be called (influenced by Erving Goffman’s [1959] work) the “community front” of Canhane’s [1959] work) the “community front” of Canhane, as if they were part of the tourist experience itself. The lodge’s truck, which is used to transfer tourists, was also often busy transporting the Canhaners or the equipment related to the water-supply work. Thus, whenever the tourists requested to use the truck, they were included in the process of community development by experiencing and testifying to the work operation. In fact, the tourists could not have experienced the lodge and Canhane without supervising the residents’ efforts. It was a museumization of work—a community “work display” (MacCannell 1999:36).

The costs of the water-supply initiative were covered by the profits from the lodge. That is to say, the money generated through tourists’ consumption in the lodge was then used by the residents toward their social betterment. The tourists could then see and experience for themselves the commitment of the Canhaners—which was powerfully aestheticized—to the proper allocation of that money and, in turn, justify their own contribution. Hence, Canhane was constituted as a comprehensive dramatic landscape in which the duty to reduce local poverty and improve social conditions was implicitly transferred from the traditional mechanisms of governance, such as the state, to a special consumer and nongovernmental category: the virtuous tourist.

“Tourism is good,” the community leader told me as he led me to a pile of black tubes for the water supply exposed across his hut. This comment flowed from our previous conversational topic; I had asked him about the water-supply efforts without approaching the topic of tourism. It was his initiative to link both subjects. While I was looking at the tubes, another man who accompanied us commented in a mild manner, “We want tourists to see us because they help us and advise us what to do: they are good” (September 11, 2006).

Canhaners were much more than just the subject of a tourist gaze (Urry 2002). They participated in the reproduction of a reality that both attests to and calls for the determinant role of tourists in transforming, directing, and monitoring the local society. In February of 2008, for example, when I was having a conversation with a resident close to a trail in Canhane, a four-wheel vehicle transporting two tourists passed by us at high speed. The inelegance of their passing caught our attention. After the cloud of dust that immersed us had vanished, the woman close to me commented: “They may be coming here to visit the community.” I asked her why. She promptly explained, “Because the tourists want to see what we are doing with their money” (February 16, 2008). Her reply announced what became obvious to me during the next months of research: residents established in their consciousness the value for the virtuous tourists, the value of being accessible, audited, and, ultimately, governable by them.

In the Mozambican village, as the resident revealed, the process of auditing the local society is assigned not to government ministries, experts, or state agents of any sort but to
the domain of a niche market activity—namely to the virtuous tourists. They are represented by the Canhaners through the rationalities, activities, duties, and responsibilities commonly attributed to those determining the appropriate “conduct of conduct,” to use Foucault’s (2008) other definition of the art of governing. Fundamentally, the residents’ representation of tourists shows how the implementation of virtuous tourism in Canhane introduced the local population to new models of leadership run by external agents and a disciplinary set of ethics coming from elsewhere.

To return to the water-supply endeavor, the Canhaners’ commitment and the accompaniment of their work were at the heart of what was being sold: it was a commodified simulation of authenticity in which not only was tourists’ consumption moralized but the processes of auditing and participating in developing the local(s) were implicitly commodified as well. Among other aspects, this is evidenced by the fact that the application of tourism revenues to the improvement of the local population was announced as a product at the lodge’s reception.

[Tourism revenues]
Used for:
- Construction of one conventional schoolroom in the village of Canhane
- Construction of a water supply system in the village of Canhane (ongoing)
- Acquisition of improved beehives for 12 villagers
- Creation of a Savings Fund for the Covane Lodge

The above text was positioned alongside the other tourist products offered at the lodge. Its explicit alignment within the recognizable tourist offerings confirms tourist consumption as developmental, purposeful, and influential. This consumption model and its endorsement by the tourists seem to be in direct contradiction with exclusionary visions of tourism as “conspicuous consumption in front of the deprived” (Crick 1989:317) or with consumers as merely the embodiment of “personal entitlement [rather] than a commitment to society’s collective well-being” (Cohen 2003:387). On the contrary, in Canhane the incorporation of social virtue and legitimacy for mentoring local development are acquired precisely through consumption. Consumerist behavior is the paramount marker of virtuosity, which subsequently qualifies the tourists to perform rulership. Virtuous tourism is, therefore, wrapped in the idea that it is for more than simple enjoyment, relaxation, and entertainment. It is the field of ethical responsibility in which those who have more guide and tend to those who have less.

I now seal the water-supply case in Canhane with a final and, perhaps, blunt, remark: the implementation of the water supply sponsored by the tourists was never accomplished. After the water tank that would supply water to the village was made operational, it was neglected by the residents. Notably, the dramaturgical experience performed by hosts and guests on the water-supply endeavor gives hints for answering John Urry’s question of “whether it is in fact possible to construct a postmodern tourist site around absolutely any object” (2002:92). Indeed, the nonoperational water tank has not only become a tourist sight in Canhane but the most visited spot by tourists. I described the details of this apparently paradoxical story elsewhere (Baptista 2010).

NEOLIBERALISM AND THE NONGOVERNMENTALIZATION OF GOVERNANCE

The performances of community-based entrepreneurialism and community development by the Canhaners do more than just enact moral subjects for the tourists: they authenticate tourists’ virtuosity by making their option of consuming vacations in Canhane an attribute of good governance in the “South.” Fundamentally, tourists are provided with a local reality capable of being improved by consumption and therefore governable by them as the consumers: “We are in your hands,” one schoolteacher said to a couple of tourists when showing them a classroom. Shortly after this comment, a resident complemented what the teacher had said. He pointed to a canhoi tro (marula tree) and revealed to the tourists, “Before, children used to attend classes under that big traditional tree.” He allowed them a few seconds to imagine that situation. Then he concluded by pointing to a sign inscribed at the entrance of another classroom behind them, “but now we have this.” The sign says in Portuguese, “Primary School of Canhane. Enlargement of the classroom. Contribution of the Covane Lodge and of the community. 2005.”

The signage reemphasizes the causal relationship between virtuous tourism and community development. By being shown the sign, the visitors were presented with progress in Canhane, a progress that was confirmed to them as explicitly bonded with their virtuous spending at the Covane Lodge.

More importantly, I think, the construction of the classroom with the revenues from the lodge was in line with virtuous tourists’ wishes. “As you have been telling us,” the resident said looking at them, “the education of our children is a priority” (January 1, 2008). His comment, however, could have not been in more contradiction with what a different teacher said on another occasion: “The worst battle I have every mornings is to bring the children to school, because their parents want them rather to help at home, grazing cattle, or in farming” (January 29, 2008). The construction of the classroom was, indeed, more in line with visitors’ ethics than with residents’ aspirations. Although they share it as a value in the presence of tourists, Canhaners reject such materialization of “community development” to a minor matter through their daily practices.

One could say that the presentation of moral everyday life to virtuous tourists in Canhane is part of the emergence of transnational forms of governing resulting from the increasing role of consumers who are self-conscious of their responsibilities for social improvement. The consumption of fair-trade products, ethical banking, and holidays in community-based schemes are examples of explicit choices
based on consumers’ considerations of justice and ethics. However, these choices ultimately reflect a latent normative context that (in)forms subjectivities. More directly, at the same time as virtuous tourists participate in nongovernmental governance in Canhane, they are also governed by a broader politics of subject-formation, which induces their self-aspirations.

On one occasion, for example, a Portuguese woman who stayed two nights at the Covane Lodge told me, “The tourism agency in Maputo didn’t want me here. They said, ‘You won’t have nice conditions, it’s a poor place, they don’t have electricity, and blah, blah, blah.’” She made her disapproval evident by reproducing the advice she was told in the agency in a loud, high tone. “My answer to them was,” she continued while switching to a calm and slower mode, “it’s precisely because of that I want to go. I had to prove to them I’m not a typical tourist.” Accordingly, despite the efforts of the travel agent, she kept and defended her choice; she thus manifested her idealized tourist status, contrasting with what she called the “typical tourist.” The basis for this choice emerged later in our conversation, as she said about the role of the LUPA NGO in Canhane: “I had heard about them [the NGO], their work, their vision. I want to help the community too, and then get back to Portugal feeling good with myself” (October 6, 2008).

As manifested by many other tourists in various ways, their desire for “help[ing] the community too” is related to a final subject: their selves. What this means is that consumption by virtuous tourists in Canhane is emotionally linked with a sense of ethics and possibility, in particular for local development but also for self-realization; this, Nikolas Rose argued, is emblematic of the era of advanced neoliberal governmentality in which “governing through society” has shifted to governing through individuals’ capacities for self-realization (Barnett et al. 2008:626). Zygmunt Bauman said, “The secret of every durable social [and, I would add, governing] system . . . is making individuals wish to do what is needed to enable the system to reproduce itself” (2007:68). If we agree with these arguments and add to them Colin Campbell’s idea that “individuals consume principally out of a desire to engage in creative acts of self-expression” (2005:24), we then arrive at an unavoidable conclusion: governance can be exercised through the circulation of incentive structures inducing consumers’ self-aspirations. The ethic of virtuous tourism in Canhane is a product of such structures. The exercise of foreign governance over the village is cloaked in moral sensitization toward the needy population and tourists’ self-realization. In Canhane, tourists can expand the moral significance of their lives by consuming for good while the act of governing the Other dissolves into the activity of virtuous tourism.

With the concept of governmentality, Foucault (2008) emphasized the ways in which subjects could be made to internalize governance through self-regulation. He stressed, for example, the technologies of the self, leading “individuals to effect, by their own means, a certain number of operations on their own bodies, on their souls, on their selves” (1993:203). Specifically, one of the main points of this article is to show that the moral duties exercised by the virtuous tourists in Canhane, which lead to the cultivation of their moral selves, occur under the auspices of a neoliberal regime masked by a set of ethics. As such, neoliberal governmentality in the Mozambican village involves a process whereby the virtuous tourists co-exercise governance over the local Other while they are themselves under a subtle regime that influences their own conduct. In other words, the virtuous tourists are both agents of and subjected to a governing order.

Contrary to what neoliberal economists claim, Foucault (2008) explained, neoliberalism should not be identified with laissez-faire but, rather, with vigilance and intervention. It involves systematic forms of control exercised over and by individuals mostly through incucement. Neoliberal governmentality authorizes external incentive structures—that is, structures beyond the state, beyond the “general apparatus (dispositif) of governmentality” (Foucault 2008:70)—to motivate desires and, by extension, manipulate the conduct of self-interested individuals through incentives and ideals. In this view, conventional forms of governance have been replaced by stimulation (Bourdieu 1990) and “sensibilization.” Robert Fletcher exemplified this when stating that, within a neoliberal governing framework, nongovernmental “conservationists would simply endeavor to provide incentives sufficient to motivate individuals to choose to behave in conservation-friendly ways” (2010:176). Jim Igoe also signaled that, “without resort to authority or compulsion,” the success of nongovernmental conservation campaigns “depends on their seductive allure . . . without the inconvenience of long-term commitment” (2010:384). They inspire passion and induce ethical agency mostly in Western consumers concerned about environmental problems. The outcome is the emergence of a moral “we” composed of consumers who consequently become participants in regulating societies.

Following this perspective, the structure of feeling of the tourism project in Canhane is driven by a set of moral incentives as well as by tourists’ self-aspirations. What this means is that the local virtuous tourism is not unilateral. Rather, it is a meaningful setting that tourists consume but that they also help to produce. The village of Canhane exemplifies a broader modern paradigm by showing the way in which, as Don Tapscott and Anthony Williams observed, “the gap between producers and consumers is blurring” (Humphreys and Grayson 2008:2). Tourist-consumers are considered here as active participants in the production of what they consume—a process commonly called “prosumption” (e.g., Humphreys and Grayson 2008). Along these lines, consumption of meaningful tourism experiences in Canhane requires virtuous tourists’ endeavors. Curiously, this resonates with the direct linguistic relation between “traveler” and the French word travailleur, which means worker. The tourists of virtuous tourism travail to the social setting that
they visit. As such, the tourism “prosumers” in Canhane do more than collect; they provide in accordance with a moral framework—“They help us,” to use a common Canhaners’ expression—and, subsequently, they rule.

To be effective, however, ethical prosumption in Canhane requires the tourists to draw on particular cultural forms and ideals for what constitutes a good society. Virtuous tourists’ agency fits into a model of ethics and an empowering process that makes the promotion of a politics of potentialities its main attribute. Indeed, community-based tourism is generally presented as providing a range of new possibilities for solving “the problems” that other ways of governance have not solved. It represents a new belief, a new beginning, a new hope, a new approach for a future better than the present and the past.

After several months at Canhane, I was often told by the residents of their disregard for the postcolonial Mozambican government. In an informal gathering, an elder said, “We were promised a lot with the independence of the country but nothing happened.” He was immediately corrected by another, “No, no, no, lets speak the truth, and the truth is that we won freedom from the big noses [the Portuguese]. This was good. The problem is we continued poor and with more diseases.” In the heart of the discussion, a new subject emerged as if it was part of the same sequence. “Well, we have the tourists now,” the driver of the lodge’s truck said, “and they can be our way out of the hole we are in” (November 2, 2008).

Taken from a wider perspective, the opening of African villages to international consumers under the aegis of virtuous tourism, as in Canhane, represents a novelty. This is the corollary to the pressing necessity to replace and the hostility to repetition that characterize the consumerist era. The morality implicit in the local community-based enterprise is, indeed, a trump in a continually expanding market society. Canhaners, on the other side, take this as an opportunity to position themselves within a global sociocultural order that values them for needing guidance from others, the virtuous tourists. Through this process, the residents of the village hope for revenues, access to development, and a connection to modern society.

Nevertheless, the virtuosity inducing tourist agency in Canhane cannot be interpreted apart from the broader productive forces that generate it. More concretely, what I have in mind here is one of Foucault’s (2008) most sound ideas: power and governance are exercised not only through the restriction of actions but also positively by inducing actions—that is to say, not through inhibition but, instead, through enabling.

What are the guiding forces informing the ethics of consumption in Canhane and, thus, inducing virtuous tourists’ agency?

ON ETHICAL DUTIES

Systems of consumption inevitably generate questions about how society should be, as they are an essential component of social practices and of relationships between selves and others. Consumption “always and inevitably raises issues of fairness, self vs. group interests” (Wilk 2001:246) and is thus an inherently moral matter (Barnett et al. 2005:26). At present, as global critiques of the disparities between “northern” abundance and “southern” scarcity become entrenched in popular discourses, consumers are thrown into the core of ethical and unethical processes. Consequently, doing good or simply not caring for the Other came to be informed by consumption choices; thus, the question of the moment became “how you as a consumer can show that you care” (Brinkmann 2004:130). Inevitably, the Other that emerges from these developments is both the object and subject of an ethics of consumption.

Just as Max Weber (2005) credited the advent of “the Spirit of Capitalism” to an underlying moral system—“The Protestant Ethic”—so could the spirit of consumption in the emergent nongovernmental governing order in the “South” be credited to a particular ethic: this ethic is informed by a myriad of policies, ideologies, campaigns, and personal experiences that enlist the virtuous tourists in practices of good governance. Yet, as David Fennell warned, “ethics too can be wrong in its support of ideologies and utopias that have more to do with the agendas of a few” (Mowforth and Munt 2009:87). Jacques Ellul also suggested that what constitutes a notion of right and wrong always emerges “in the interest of” a “few,” which ultimately “provides the individual with a clear vision of moral duty” (1969:121). So the question that still needs an answer is: Who are the “few” ascribing the ethical meanings to virtuous tourists’ consumption in Canhane? This is where “development” enters the field as the point of reference.

As part of the vision of empowerment that hovers over community-based organizations in the “South,” the management of the entire tourism business in Canhane was formally attributed to the Canhaners by the NGO Helvetas. More precisely, on paper, the management of tourism was assigned to a committee of ten representatives elected by the residents in 2002. However, this was impractical. Just to give a brief example, at the end of January of 2008 I attended a meeting held in Canhane for its residents. Several subjects concerning the village were discussed. When the topic of the lodge came up, its executive manager, who is neither from Canhane nor a resident, took the lead. He presented the lodge’s expenses and incomes to the audience. At the end, I asked a nearby teacher why the president, or any other member, of the Social Management Committee was not presenting the financial report to the population, as the official statutes of the community-based business required. He said, “How can they, if they don’t know how to read the numbers?” (January 26, 2008). Therefore, how can the committee be responsible for the management, planning, and financial administration of the lodge if its members do not have skills in basic math; do not have access to computers, Internet, or newspapers; do not know the principles of international currency; and are inexperienced in
commercial business activities? After spending several months in Canhane, the answer became quite evident: by resorting to, being dependent on, and remaining under the rule of external providers.

On one occasion, I raised the issue of the lack of skills on the part of the Canhaners who constitute the committee to a member of the NGO’s staff that implemented the tourism project. “That’s why we have to develop more training sessions in Canhane. This is the way to empower them,” he answered (February 20, 2008). As mentioned before, the training sessions that he referred to, which had become abundant in the village since the implementation of virtuous tourism, were all sponsored by international organizations donating to the NGOs he worked for, namely Helvetas and LUPA. What this means is that, rather than empowering “them,” the residents, the community-based tourism in Canhane empowers the NGOs. Pragmatically speaking, at the time of the lodge’s construction, Helvetas’ staff asked Canhaners to list their main priorities for use of the revenues from the lodge. The answers were a health center, water supply, a grocery shop, and access to electricity. Yet, when I left the village in December of 2008, almost six years after their responses and after four years of virtuous tourists’ visits to Canhane, none of these priorities had been accomplished.

Put plainly then, by representing the underdeveloped community, Canhaners are drawn into a system in which they become producers and partners in generating funds in and for development. As such, Canhane is integrated into tourism as a neoliberal economic opportunity for the development sector. Moreover, in this process Canhaners emerge as governable subjects by a new ruling order of nongovernmental agents. This should not be surprising, but it is the obvious consequence of the increasing role of the aid industry, not only in Canhane but also in the entire region of Southern Africa. As it infiltrates almost all spheres of social life, the nongovernmental development ideology actively contributes to the production of new markets and new governing arrangements. In these arrangements, individuals from distant geographies—virtuous tourists—are induced to engage in meaningful activities and commitments as ethical consumers. Indeed, virtuous tourists participate in a peculiar activity in the sense that the consumers are the ones who travel (travail) to collect and produce the goods. Basically, the emergent nongovernmental order taking over Canhane draws on consumption as a realm through which transnational agents can participate in governing projects, and virtuous tourism is the apparatus used for that purpose.

However, these regulatory practices are only able to gallop successfully throughout the “South” because they are masked by ethics. This is implicit, for example, in the Entrepreneurship Award the residents of Canhane won “in recognition,” —in the diploma’s description, “of outstanding entrepreneurial spirit.” The prize aimed at “Making Markets Work for the Poor” and organized by the international development organization VSO was held in October 2010 in Blantyre, Malawi. The use of the market, a set of ethics, and the tourist-consumers for making a better world and “changing lives,” as described in the award’s slogan, reflect the NGO’s ultimate goal: “Participation and Governance (P&G) in Africa, Asia, the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean.” All in all, what seems obvious in Canhane is that behind the labyrinthine practices carried out at the local level, the residents have become subjugated allies of the non-governmental development rationale. How? By performing a governable and consumable reality in which nongovernmental institutions and virtuous tourists can exercise ruling authority.

If it is true that the involvement of development in tourism is to a certain degree a response to both a global humanitarian order and the existing consumer expectations, then it is also correct to say that this depends on the encounter’s protagonists at the local level: the hosts and guests. Their actions exhibit a strong commitment to the developmentalization of tourism—“developmenttourism” (Baptista 2011)—and foster the means by which tourism becomes a moralizing tool of consumption and the virtuous tourist a participative agent of globalizing non-governmental governance. As I mentioned above, by also being co-producers of “community development in the Third World”—to use the “developmentalese” language—virtuous tourists are an operational resource for nongovernmental development institutions. Along with this process, and with the hope of benefiting from the commoditization of human life in the modern world, Canhaners capitalize on the potentialities brought by the globalization of a disciplinary ethics as a way of being included in the network of global existence. For the local inhabitants, virtuous tourism is a way of gaining access to and becoming represented in the global by being an expression of the “South”: that is, in need, moral, seeking development, and thus governable by nongovernmental agents. Canhaners are Orientalized (Said 1978) and self-Orientalize themselves in virtuous tourism.

Bauman noted that the most salient causal factor in the neoliberal revolution in governmental activity was the “subsidiarizing” or ‘contracting out’ more and more of the functions previously politically directed and administered [by state governments] in favor of explicitly non-political market forces” (2007:144). In Canhane, these new governing forces are nongovernmental institutions, their professional employees, and transnational tourist-consumers. In this framework, consuming (while on) holidays and embodying virtue are not contradictory because consumption means providing assistance. As Neil Lawson said, “As there is nothing else to fall back on, it is likely that people then give up on the whole notion of . . . a democratic society and fall back on the market as the arbiter of provision” (2000:18). However, more than the market itself, the increasing non-governmental governing order in Canhane—and, I believe, in the “South”—is based, to quote Frank Furedi, “on the premise that unelected individuals who possess a lofty moral
purpose have a greater right to act on the public’s behalf than politicians elected” (Bauman 2007:146).

That said, the ethics and moral purpose that legitimate unelected NGO leaders and the virtuous tourists participating in the governance of Canhane are ultimately ordered by the rationalities of the development sector, which campaigns around issues of community well-being in the “South.” Such ethics provide the incentives and validity for the virtuous tourists to perform governance through consumption. Whether propagating humanitarian justification for consumption in deprived societies, or by self-representing the problem solving in these same societies, development here operates as a technique of recolonizing historically subjugated people through inducing the ethical aspirations in tourist-consumers’ selves.

CONCLUSION

It was not my intention to generalize the accounts presented here to all NGOs and to all tourists visiting community-based enterprises. Any effort to provide reliable conclusions about these subjects must be careful in view of the heterogeneity of the development sector, its nongovernmental institutions, and the nature of ethical tourists. Nonetheless, virtuous tourism in Canhane does provide evidence about the way the advent of new ethical models of consumption draws in broader development forces that help constitute what it is to be moral, as well as how the “South” is used in this process. NGOs and virtuous tourists, which belong to a sector that obtains legitimacy through performing selflessness, are at the vanguard of this movement. However, this article demonstrates that the consumption practices derived from and in line with such an ideology of selflessness represent instead one of the key sites of moral self-formation in the contemporary era of neoliberal governmentality.

Canhane exemplifies how the institutionalization of need can work as a lever for the appropriation of populations and public subjects by translocal agents. The ethical paradigm inherent in community-based arrangements, in contexts of scarcity, allows tourism and development industries to legitimately appropriate new areas and expand capitalist growth. In turn, ethics becomes a vital subject in consumers’ attempts to develop and affirm their meaningful selves, as well as in the process of degovernmentalizing governance. Therefore, to put it succinctly and conclusively, what I suggest in this work is that African states’ progressive dissociation from governing (Mbembe 2001) is directly associated with the neoliberal nongovernmentalization of governing public spheres.

The virtuous tourists play and perform a participating role in governing Canhane. The value they earn from spending holidays in the village is more than simply the enjoyment of contributing to local development: they derive personal moral gratification and engage in the role of governance. However, as particularly revealed by the results of the water-supply endeavor and Canhaners’ negligence of the classroom built with the lodge revenues, my empirical work exposes the outcomes of the virtuous tourists’ governing task as transient and illusory. Most of all, besides being producers and consumers (prosumers), the virtuous tourists are also involved in this process as products. They move out of ethical anonymity to become a product of their self-aspirations, ruled by the disciplinary ethics of development. This is in line with the tacit practice of regulation that Bauman called “the commoditization of consumers” (2007:24). Nevertheless, regardless of the illusory character of their agency, while performing rulership, virtuous tourists contribute to the fading agency of institutions democratically elected to govern and help replace them with nongovernmental institutions. Understood along these lines, the contemporary emergence of new models of ethical tourism consumption in the “South” seems to replicate the relationships of power exercised in the advancement of colonization rather than actually accomplishing the principled aspirations rhetorically celebrated by their advocates. This time, however, recolonization is disguised as being ethical, most significantly through the intermediary of nongovernmental agents.

Consumer capitalism is not dead, as the former president of Brazil, Lula da Silva, declared in February of 2011 at the World Social Forum held in Dakar. Rather, it can take different faces and masquerade as ethical. While positioned as both the object and subject of a global ethics of responsibility, the Other in the virtuous tourism of Canhane is reduced to being at once the instrument of tourist-consumers’ self-investments and the subject of nongovernmental governance.

João Afonso Baptista
Institut für Ethnologie, University of Hamburg, 20146 Hamburg, Germany; joao.baptista@uni-hamburg.de

NOTES

Acknowledgments. I wish to thank the editor of the American Anthropologist, Tom Boellstorff, and the anonymous reviewers for their commitment and enthusiastic, yet pointed, criticisms. This work would have not been possible, as well, without the support of the population of Canhane, the staff of Helvetas and LUPA, the tourists who visited the village, and one of the most impressive persons I ever met, who lived close to Canhane: the Muata de Massingir. I am deeply grateful to all of them. Finally, this article is based on research supported by the Graduate School Society and Culture in Motion.

2. Previously, I carried out intermittent fieldwork in Canhane for a total period of three months, in between 2006 and 2008.
4. That is, a menu of meals and drinks, accommodation, and what were listed as “tourist products”: “local dances,” “village walk,” “boat trip,” “medicinal plants,” and “visits to the Limpopo National Park.”
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